

**Minutes  
Newton Planning Commission  
October 27, 2009  
Council Chambers  
City Hall**

The regular meeting of the Newton Planning Commission was held at 7:00 p.m. on October 27, 2009 in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

**Members**

**Present:** Stan Gabriel  
Ken Simmons  
Jim Smith  
Donny Setzer  
Mark Stalnaker  
Kent Elliott  
Jimmy Newsome, Jr.

**Members**

**Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Glenn J. Pattishall, AICP, Planning Director/Asst. City Manager  
Alex Fulbright, AICP, Assistant Planning Director

**Others:** None

---

---

**Item 2: Consideration of Minutes September 22, 2009 Meeting**

**Chairman Simmons** asked for consideration of the minutes of the September 22, 2009 meeting. **Mr. Elliott** made several suggestions for changes to the minutes. There being no further discussion, **Chairman Simmons** ruled that the minutes were approved as amended.

**Item 3: Old Business--Continued Discussion on Eastside and Southeast Implementation - Zoning Ordinance**

**Mr. Fulbright** read from his October 21, 2009 memo to the Planning Commission outlining proposed changes to the current zoning ordinance to be applicable citywide not only to implement the Southeast and East Side Area Plan recommendations in terms of implementation. He talked specifically about access management and connectivity, sidewalks, buffers and screening, manufactured housing appearance criteria and overall appearance criteria.

**Mr. Fulbright** used a drawing on an easel to demonstrate the examples of how proposed language would address access management.

**Mr. Smith** clarified that this was for new development only and questioned its applicability to single family residential. **Mr. Fulbright** responded that was correct; that it had

to do with new development and redevelopment and did not apply to Single Family Residential sites.

**Mr. Stalnaker** asked how this is different than with the Subdivision Regulations. **Mr. Fulbright** said that the Planning Commission had previously looked at the creation of streets in the Subdivision Regulations. He explained that the Zoning Ordinance deals with post-subdivision development.

With regard to sidewalks, **Mr. Fulbright** explained that sidewalks were installed as development occurs. The intent of proposed language is that sidewalks will eventually be connected as development occurs over time. It would not apply to Single Family Residential sites.

**Mr. Stalnaker** asked about in the case of a church. **Mr. Fulbright** responded it would be required if it was adjacent to a commercial use or commercial zoning.

**Mr. Fulbright** reviewed the buffer and screening proposals. He explained the need to address topography so that sites are adequately screened and how screening can be outside of the buffer if topography dictates. **Mr. Elliott** questioned what would happen if a residential use was higher in elevation than an industrial use.

**Mr. Fulbright** responded that this will address the different types of vegetation such as the height over a time period and possibly requiring taller species and installation.

**Mr. Fulbright** reviewed the proposed mobile home appearance criteria. He said that the current regulations address double-wides only and that proposed language will apply to all types of mobile homes.

**Mr. Fulbright** discussed appearance criteria for structures and sites. He went over the proposed criteria from the St. Paul's overlay district, explaining building and site design elements. He asked if metal-sided buildings should be banned. **Mr. Elliott** indicated that he did not feel metal-sided buildings should be banned; that it would put more cost on companies. He was okay with requiring a brick façade where it was adjacent to a street.

**Mr. Setzer** asked if there will be different standards for different areas. **Mr. Fulbright** responded we currently have that, but this will make it citywide. He explained the experience of the St. Paul's Area when the regulations were developed.

**Mr. Stalnaker** asked to see picture examples. **Mr. Elliott** mentioned visibility versus the façade visibility to a street. **Mr. Fulbright** used a diagram to explain how the proposed regulations would apply.

**Mr. Smith** asked about what happens when a new street is cut in next to an existing building and the side is metal and also asked if standards were too little as compared to Lincoln County.

**Mr. Fulbright** responded that the applicability of the standards were limited to 15,000 square feet. He said any larger buildings would have to meet a higher standard.

**Mr. Elliott** gave a warehouse example and said he felt that it seemed ludicrous to require so much brick. **Mr. Fulbright** suggested an alternative for a side-facing street, such as landscaping to break up the façade appearance.

**Mr. Smith** asked what Conover and Hickory do. **Mr. Fulbright** responded nothing consistent. He said it varies, depending on the district. He explained that Conover uses a development agreement to get concessions from property owners and builders. He stated that some standards are subjective. He gave an example on McLin Creek Road as poor aesthetics that involved a warehouse building near Hanes Converting.

**Mr. Stalnaker** asked what the options were. **Mr. Fulbright** responded that it would be citywide versus a district overlay.

**Mr. Elliott** expressed a desire to ease into the standards. He said he did not feel that the City should go to extreme standards in some areas as it applies to existing development.

**Mr. Setzer** said the City has drug its feet over the years and needed to start doing something now to level the playing field. He felt that in the long run these appearance standards would help the City.

**Mr. Fulbright** thanked the Planning Commission for their input and said that he would follow up on their request for additional information, pictures, etc. and that at the November meeting the Planning Commission would be presented with the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Proposed Draft Regulations to review prior to hearing and recommendation to Council.

#### **Presentation of Core Area Plan**

**Mr. Fulbright** handed out copies of the Draft Core Area Plan and went over the process. He said that the November meeting would be a work session to discuss maps and issues to gain Planning Commission feedback on areas of interest.

#### **Item 3: New Business**

There was none.

#### **Item 4: Reports**

**Mr. Pattishall** reviewed the September, 2009 monthly reports.

#### **Item 5: Adjournment**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Glenn J. Pattishall/AICP  
Recording Secretary

ds